



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/017,644	12/14/2001	Merih Pasin	US20010246	7924
173	7590	09/10/2004	EXAMINER	
WHIRLPOOL PATENTS COMPANY - MD 0750 500 RENAISSANCE DRIVE - SUITE 102 ST. JOSEPH, MI 49085			PERRIN, JOSEPH L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1746	

DATE MAILED: 09/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

10/017,644

Applicant(s)

PASIN ET AL. *cl*

Examiner

Joseph L. Perrin, Ph.D.

Art Unit

1746

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 17 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): claims 9-10 rejected under 35 USC 102(b) over Parlour.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: \_\_\_\_\_.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: 1-20.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 21-28.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☒ Other: See Continuation Sheet

*Frankie L. Stinson*  
**FRANKIE L. STINSON**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**  
**GROUP 3400 / 700**

Continuation of 10. Other: The 35 USC 102(b) rejection of claims 9-10 over Parlour is withdrawn in view of applicant's incorporation of previously indicated allowable subject matter into claim 9.

The 35 USC 102(b) rejection of claims 21-24 over Conley and 35 USC 103(a) rejection of claims 25-28 over Conley and Estes are maintained for reasons of record.

Specifically, Applicant argues that the light source of Conley is not located in the collapsible bag. This is not persuasive because Conley discloses the lights "mounted in an upper portion of the bag 11' so as to be clearly visible to a user of the invention" (col. 5, line 66 et seq.), and Figure 8 clearly shows the connecting wires of the display panel and the display panel located inside the container/bag). Even if, arguendo, one were to construe the light source of Conley as not being in the container, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to place the visible light source inside the container since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. In re Japikse, 86 USPQ 70. It is noted that the pertinent art cited in the previous rejection (Hubner) discloses the known concept of a light source inside a collapsible transparent garment treatment bag.